

REMARKS

Claims 16-34 are pending in this communication. Claim 18 stands objected to based on a grammatical error. Claims 16-26, and 28-34 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Bushnell (EP 1,267,557). Claim 27 stands rejected to under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Bushnell in view of Singh (US 6,389,278).

Claim 18 has been amended to correct the grammatical error. Claims 29-34 have been amended to correct grammar. Independent claims 16 and 28 have been amended in light of the prior art presented by Examiner. No new matter has been presented.

Claim 16 has been amended to include the following claim language: “wherein the electronic directory system is located in at least one of the first and second telecommunication terminals, and the electronic directory system is maintained by a user of the at least one of the first and second telecommunication terminals.” This is supported at least in part by paragraph [0061] of the Substitute Specification, which states “...even the directory system itself can be implemented individually or in combination on the terminal.” This is further supported at least by paragraph [0026] of the Substitute Specification, which discusses “Alternatively or additionally, the telecommunications service and/or the directory system can also be implemented on the terminals themselves. In this case, it is conceivable that the subscribers themselves maintain the directories on their terminals, for example, or that these are maintained by means of teleservicing by an administrator.” Additional support can be found at least in paragraphs [0040], [0045], and [0060]. Claim 26 was also amended to reflect an expanded directory system, as supported by the above. Similarly, Claim 28 was amended to include the above limitations.

35 USC 102 Rejections

Independent claim 16, and its dependent claims 17-26, stand rejected as anticipated by Bushnell (EP 1267557). In independent claim 16 Applicant now claims “wherein the electronic directory system is *located in at least one of the first and second telecommunication terminals*, and the electronic directory system is *maintained by a user* of the at least one of the first and second telecommunication terminals.” Bushnell does not teach either of these new aspects of Applicant’s independent claim 16. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner

withdraw the 35 USC 102 rejection of independent claim 16, and claims 17-26 which depend from and include all the limitations of independent claim 16, based on Bushnell.

Independent claim 28, and its dependent claims 29-34, stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Bushnell (EP 1267557). In independent claim 28 Applicant now claims “a second terminal associated with the first call number; the electronic directory system located in at least one of the first and second terminals.” Bushnell does not teach this new aspect of Applicant’s independent claim 28. Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the 35 USC 102 rejection of independent claim 28, and claims 29-34 which depend from and include all the limitations of independent claim 28, based on Bushnell.

35 USC 103 Rejections

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Bushnell in view of Singh (US 6389278). Examiner admits that Bushnell does not teach the telecommunication service and/or the directory system is implemented in the first terminal, but that Singh teaches this. Applicant has amended dependent claim 27 such that “the telecommunication service *and* the directory system are implemented in the first terminal.”

Singh teaches the seeking of alternative call choices as being initiated by the wireless communicator. This is done by determining what type of service provider is being called initially, and searching for others who provide the same or similar service. (Col. 5, ll. 32-39.) Figure 2, block 230, describes the process for obtaining the alternate numbers. Upon detection of the need for alternative telephone numbers: “Preferably, the listing of at least a second telephone number is obtained by wirelessly obtaining a *Yellow Page* directory listing *from the internet*.” (Col. 5, ll. 45-47.) In contrast, Applicant claims “a directory system query unit configured for submitting a query to an electronic directory system in order to identify a second call number assigned to a first call number,” and “wherein the telecommunication service *and* the directory system are implemented in the first terminal.” Singh teaches obtaining alternate telephone numbers from an internet directory, while Applicant claims at least querying a directory in the first telecommunication terminal. Thus, Singh does not teach this aspect of Applicant’s independent claim 27. Applicant respectfully requests Examiner withdraw the 35 USC 103 rejection of dependent claim 27.


Conclusion

Reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/23/13

By: 

John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830